REMARKS

Claim 1 calls for advising a website hosting facility sufficiently before video information containing a uniform resource locator is distributed to a receiver of the resource locator in order to enable the facility to prepare for an increased access load. For example, when the video information, in the form of a television program, is broadcast to a large number of receivers and all those receivers receive the program and the URL, they may all attempt to access that URL at the same time. Thus, the website hosting that URL is advised of the impending broadcast so that they can prepare to handle the increased load.

The examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hidary (US 5,774,664) in view of Parasnis (US 6,728,753). This rejection is respectfully traversed. In particular, Parasnis fails to cure the deficiencies of Hidary.

Nowhere in the citations in the Office action to columns 14 and 15 is it disclosed that Parasnis' system provides a broadcast video containing a URL. In fact, the passages of Parasnis cited by the examiner make no mention of an URL at all. The citations do discuss the possibility that *a user* who desires to broadcast a presentation having the option to select a net show provider. However, selecting a net show provider in and of itself does not cure the deficiency of Hidary. Namely, examiner has not shown that scheduling information about when the URL referred to in the Office is sent to a web site hosting facility sufficiently before video information containing the URL is distributed to a receiver of the URL and video information to enable the facility to prepare for an increased access load.

For instance, to attend a broadcast in Parasnis, an attendee *must* access a lobby page to receive the broadcast. Column 23, lines 14-15. The net show server streams audio/visual content to *attendees who link their browsers to the URL* assigned for the presentation broadcast. Column 24, lines 19-22; column 26, lines 30-36. In other words, the server multicasts only to those attendees who have accessed the lobby page and linked to the URL assigned for the presentation broadcast. *Id.* *See also*, column 22, line 67—column 23, line 25. As such, the attendee receives the URL assigned for the presentation broadcast *before* it receives the broadcast. Moreover, there has been no showing that the URL is scheduled for transmission to a potential attendee sufficiently before the URL is distributed to a receiver of the URL. In this way, Parasnis is no different than Hidary; neither disclose sending, to a web site hosting facility, scheduling information about when a uniform resource locator will be transmitted, sufficiently

PAGE 3/4 * RCVD AT 8/15/2005 2:13:42 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:7134688883 * DURATION (mm-ss):01-54

before video information containing the uniform resource locator is distributed to a receiver of the uniform resource locator and video information to enable the facility to prepare for an increased access load. Quite simply, there is no suggestion in either of the cited references of warning a website hosting facility when a program is about to be broadcast, including a URL that points to a website hosted by that website hosting facility. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims is respectfully requested.

On the same basis, the rejection of claims 11 and 21 and respective dependent claims should be reconsidered.

In view of these remarks, the application should now be in condition for allowance. The examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 15, 2005

Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation

PAGE 4/4 * RCVD AT 8/15/2005 2:13:42 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:7134688883 * DURATION (mm-ss):01-54